

### **III. REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-22, 24-27, 29-32 and 34-35 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 13, 16, 22, 26 and 31 have been amended herein; and, claims 2, 3, 10, 23, 28 and 33 are cancelled herein. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Puri (U.S. Patent No. 6,064,982), hereinafter “Puri”, and Barritz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,027), hereinafter “Barritz”.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Puri, Applicants assert that Puri does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to currently amended claim 1, and similarly claimed in independent claims 7, 13, 16, 22, 26 and 31, Applicants submit that Puri fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, weighting possible responses to the set of questions based on **the business strategy of the business entity**, wherein the weighting comprises **assigning a value for each possible response to the set of questions**, and **wherein there are at least three possible responses to the question in the set of questions**. (emphasis added). Further, Barritz does not remedy this glaring deficiency in Puri.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the features previously found in claims 2 and 3 as well as additional features (e.g., answer type). As such, Applicants address the rejections and reasoning for claims 2 and 3. Applicants further cite paragraphs [0060] through [0073] for examples of supporting disclosure for portions of the amended features. In any event, the Office alleges that the weighting feature is taught in Puri at column 5, lines 3-15 and Figure 4. Office Action, item 5, pages 5-6. Applicants have read the cited sections, and Puri in its entirety, and respectfully contend that Puri is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the aforementioned features.

First, the cited specification does not teach or suggest weighting the possible responses where the weighting comprises assigning a value for each possible response to the set of questions, and wherein there are at least three possible responses to the question in the set of questions. Figure 4 merely shows binary-type questions (i.e., “yes”, “no” answers) for a customer. Clearly, there are no multiple (i.e., three or more) answer type questions suggested in Puri whatsoever. In other words, the range-type questions, wherein the various answers are weighted do not exist in Puri. These features are not taught or suggested by Puri.

Also, the cited specification section merely discusses the needs of a *customer*. There is never any suggestion of any type of weighting related to that of a *business entity*. Figure 4, in Puri, further buttresses this difference. The feature is not taught by Puri.

Thus, Puri does not teach the weighting of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Office's rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since Puri does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections based under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 7, 2007

/ Joseph J. Christian /

Joseph J. Christian  
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044